
Agency Information

AGENCY : HSCA
RECORD NUMBER : 180-10142-10135
RECORD SERIES : CIA SEGREGATED COLLECTION
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 23-15-11

Document Information

ORIGINATOR : HSCA
FROM : CIA
TO :
TITLE :
DATE : 00/00/0000
PAGES : 5
SUBJECTS :
CUBANA AIRLINES
CIA, METHODOLOGY
DOCUMENT TYPE : REPORT
CLASSIFICATION : Unclassified
RESTRICTIONS : 1A; 1B
CURRENT STATUS : Redact
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 08/07/1995
OPENING CRITERIA :
COMMENTS : Box 12

Released under the John
F. Kennedy
Assassination Records
Collection Act of 1992
(44 USC 2107 Note).
Case#:NW 53080 Date:
06-01-2017

NOVEMBER 22, 1963 CUBANA FLIGHT

need better citation)

(Book V of the Senate Intelligence Committee Report) *discusses* ~~refers to~~ a reported five-hour delay (6:00PM

*Isent
more a gangster
on story*

EST to 11:00 PM EST) of a Cubana flight from Mexico *City* to Havana the evening of President Kennedy's assassination, November 22, 1963. (Senate Intelligence

Committee Report, April 23, 1976, p.30) The most

intriguing aspect *SS account involved* ~~of the report was that~~ the alleged

of the Cubana flight delay ~~was~~ to await arrival at 10:30 PM EST of a pri-

the aircraft vate twin-engined aircraft, which deposited an uni-

dentified passenger who boarded the Cubana aircraft

without customs clearance and traveled to Havana

in the pilot's cabin. (ibid ps. 60 -61) The Senate

Intelligence Committee *stated* ~~wrote~~ that the Central In-

telligence Agency "had no information indicating

that a followup investigation was conducted to deter-

mine the identity of the passenger and had no fur-

ther information on the passenger, and no explan-

ation for why a followup investigation was not con-

ducted." (ibid p.61)

The Senate Intelligence Committee Report raises four major questions:

- a) Did the Central Intelligence Agency *inform* ~~write~~ the Senate Intelligence Committee that no investigation of the November 22, 1963 Cubana flight was conducted?

*what's
so
important
about
this*

- b) Did the Central Intelligence Agency further investigate the allegation? (after SSC report publ. or after event took place?)
- c) What were the results of the Central Intelligence Agency investigation?
- d) Were the results of the Central Intelligence Agency investigation forwarded to the Senate Intelligence Committee?

In an attempt to answer the questions raised by the Senate Intelligence Committee Report, the House Select Committee on Assassinations has ~~been~~ ^{utilized}

the following ^{investigative procedure}

- a) Conducted an extensive review of the Central Intelligence Agency files that pertain to the November 22, 1963 Cubana flights. ^{analyzed}
- b) Reviewed Tab B of the 1977 CIA Staff Report which ^{concerned above-cited} included a section on the November 22, 1963 Cubana flights. ^{analyzed}
- c) Reviewed the February 4, 1976 Central Intelligence Agency letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee.

DID THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY WRITE THE SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE THAT NO INVESTIGATION OF THE NOVEMBER 22, 1963 CUBANA FLIGHT WAS CONDUCTED?

After a careful review of the February 4, 1976 Central Intelligence Agency letter to the

does
sound
very
impressive

Inspector General's Report

What
was
this
letter
about -
ident. by it
is a more
formal task

its not just enough to say we determined something - on what basis did we make the determination?

Senate Intelligence Committee, the House Select

Committee on Assassinations has determined that the

Senate Intelligence's interpretation of the letter

is misleading. The Central Intelligence Agency wrote

the Senate Intelligence Committee that the Mexican

authorities were asked about the reported flight

delay, although there was no recorded response. (CIA

letter to Senate Intelligence Committee, 2/4/76)

DID THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY FURTHER INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATION?

The Central Intelligence Agency conducted

regular surveillance of Cubana flights, filing cable

reports to Headquarters. (1977 CIA Staff Report, Tab B,

p. 11) There was one unilateral CIA surveillance team (LIFIRE)

that observed arrivals and departures of Cubana

flights, reporting any unusual incidents and providing

copies of flight manifests. (ibid, p.11) The Mexican

government ~~also~~ ^{its own} had a surveillance team of its own

at the airport which provided the CIA with photo-

graphs of passports and copies of passenger lists.

(ibid p.11) ^{In addition} ~~Additionally~~, a telephone tap operation

(LIENVOY) against the Cuban Embassy provided trans-

cripts of conversations ~~with~~ ^{between} the Cubana office and

the Mexican Airport Control office. (cite)

(ibid p.11)

quote pertinent language to demonstrate the trust of letter

analysis?

Is this of persons traveling to Cuba? Is this of persons traveling to Cuba? If so, state it

Is this CIA joint operation?

WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
AGENCY INVESTIGATION?

What is
so key
about
this
you need
better
analysis

DIFFERENCE SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE AND HOUSE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS FINDINGS

pertaining to...

The House Select Committee on Assassinations
findings differ from those of the Senate Intelligence
Committee in the following manner:

a) The Cubana flight was on the ground in Mexico
City for a total of four hours and about ten minutes.
It was not delayed five hours as reported in Book V.

(cite)

b) The Cubana flight departed at 2035 hours Mexico City time, 55 minutes ahead of the alleged arrival at 2130 of a private flight with a secret passenger.. *(c, IR)*

c) The 2035 departure also contrasts further with the Senate Intelligence Committee Report that the Cubana flight departed at 2200. *c, IR*

may be what to compare

No record of a November 22, 1963 twin-engine aircraft carrying a lone passenger exists. *(on what basis can we assert this?)* In addition, no record exists of a passenger traveling to Havana in the pilot's cabin. *After careful review of the Lienvoy transcripts and Mexico Airport by both the CIA & Mexican government* In view of the surveillance coverage of the ~~Cubana flight~~, it is doubtful that the alleged activity involving the private twin-engined aircraft and passenger would have gone unnoticed or unreported had it occurred. *(Should explain how this story came to be reported by SSC)*

WERE THE RESULTS OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY FORWARDED TO THE SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE

(What is this government above?)

The Central Intelligence Agency gave the Senate Intelligence Committee only the informant allegations. The Senate Intelligence Committee did not review the LIFIRE or LIENVOY records. *(c, IR)* Relying solely on the informant's allegations, the Senate Intelligence Committee could not have reported the story any differently.